UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) No. 4:16-CV-180-CDF
CITY OF FERGUSON, MISSOURI,)
Defendant.)

STATUS CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CATHERINE D. PERRY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 7, 2016

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: Christy Ellen Lopez, Esq.

Amy Senier, Esq.

Charles Wesley Hart, Jr., Esq.

Chiraag Bains, Esq.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For Defendant: Jared Lyons Hasten, Esq.

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

REPORTED BY: Gayle D. Madden, CSR, RDR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

United States District Court

111 South Tenth Street, Third Floor

St. Louis, MO 63102 (314) 244-7987

(Produced by computer-aided mechanical stenography.)

(Proceedings commenced at 1:06 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. We're here in the case of United States of America versus the City of Ferguson. This is Case No. 4:16-CV-180, and we are here for a status hearing and for the parties to tell me what's going on with the settlement and, I guess, to some extent introduce me to the Monitor, et cetera.

So for the Plaintiff, for the United States, would you all introduce yourselves for me?

MS. LOPEZ: Your Honor, I'm Christy Lopez.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SENIER: Amy Senier.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BAINS: Chiraag Bains.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HART: Charles Hart.

THE COURT: All right. And for the Defendant?

MR. HASTEN: Jared Hasten.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hasten.

And then so from the Plaintiffs -- well, why don't you all just tell me what -- from the United States -- what you think you need to report. I do have your status report, and if one of you would like to introduce the members of the Monitoring Team, that would be fine. Obviously, I've studied their résumés and everything. So I sort of know who they are,

9/7/2016 Status Conference 3 1 but --2. MS. LOPEZ: That would be wonderful. We'd love to 3 have the Monitoring Team introduce their team. 4 We were thinking that, perhaps, the City of Ferguson 5 could tell the Court its views of where they are, what the 6 status of this case is. You could have the opportunity to ask 7 any questions. We could then speak, and then you could hear from the Monitoring Team, but if you want a different order --8 9 THE COURT: That sounds fine. That sounds fine to 10 me. So, first, let me hear from the Monitoring Team as to who 11 you are. I know -- I looked at your pictures. I read your 12 résumés, but go ahead if you will. 13 MR. ERVIN: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm Clark Ervin, 14 the Monitor. Sam Rosenthal. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. ERVIN: Ed Davis. 17 MR. DAVIS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 19 MR. ERVIN: Frances McLeod. 20 MS. MCLEOD: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 21

MR. ERVIN: Delores Jones-Brown.

MS. JONES-BROWN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

MR. ERVIN: Natashia Tidwell.

22

2.3

24

25

MS. TIDWELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

MR. ERVIN: And Kimberly Norwood.

1 THE COURT: All right. 2 MR. ERVIN: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right. Mr. Hasten, I'll hear your report, and 4 5 like I say, I do have the spreadsheet. It was -- you know, I 6 looked at it fairly closely. It's somewhat -- I'm somewhat 7 able to understand it, and I did appreciate that you sent my 8 assistant a copy of that in an Excel version so if I want to 9 make my own notes I can. So I appreciate that. 10 MR. HASTEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Before we get 11 started, I just wanted to introduce some members of the 12 Ferguson City Council --13 THE COURT: Oh, yes. Thank you. 14 MR. HASTEN: -- who are present here in court today. 15 THE COURT: Yeah. 16 MR. HASTEN: Councilwoman Linda Lipka. 17 Councilwoman --18 THE COURT: Tell me her name again. 19 MR. HASTEN: Linda Lipka. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Lipka. 21 MR. HASTEN: Councilwoman Ella Jones. Councilwoman 22 Laverne Mitchom. 23 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, all, for being 24 here. 25 MR. HASTEN: And we also have some officials from the

5 City of Ferguson today here, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. HASTEN: City Manager De'Carlon Seewood. THE COURT: Okay. 4 5 MR. HASTEN: Ferguson Police Chief Delrish Moss. 6 THE COURT: All right. 7 MR. HASTEN: Ferguson Deputy Police Chief Al 8 Eickhoff. 9 THE COURT: Greetings. 10 MR. HASTEN: And City Clerk Christine Lanfersieck. 11 And I apologize if I mispronounced that. 12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. 13 MR. HASTEN: So, Your Honor, we're here today on a 14 status report. Since we last saw Your Honor on April 19th, I 15 think we've made some good progress. 16 First and foremost, the City hired Chief Moss before 17 the Consent Decree was actually approved by Your Honor, but he 18 didn't take office until mid May and has gone through great 19 lengths to get up to speed with the Consent Decree, to explain 20 it to his command staff and to officers of the Ferguson Police 21 Department. 22 And in a similar vein too, City Manager De'Carlon 23 Seewood has explained what the Consent Decree is, what it 24 entails to City officials. He's made that known to the Court

Clerk as well, and it's been explained to court personnel.

25

So I think that's really the first step, Your Honor, is that City officials and City employees know what this Consent Decree is, and they know what it entails, and they know what is expected of them.

The parties also worked, Your Honor, as you know, to select the Monitoring Team. We put in a lot of time and effort to do that, and we were excited with Mr. Ervin's selection, and we believe his team offers a breadth of experience and resources, and we're excited to work with them and to kind of begin this next step of implementation, which is monitoring assessment and compliance as to where the City is.

So we're -- actually, we've scheduled all day meetings tomorrow to give Mr. Ervin the opportunity to meet with City officials, to meet with court staff, and to hear what they have to say about what's going on with the Consent Decree and where the City stands.

And in terms of the 30-, 60-, 90-, and 120-day deadlines, those are the benchmarks that have come and passed since Your Honor implemented the Consent Decree or approved it on April 19th, 2016, and I think, from what you could see in the spreadsheet, the City's done a lot of work. We haven't waited for Mr. Ervin to begin his duties as the Monitor.

We've tried to pick up the ball and just run with things and implement a lot of what we need to do, and I think you can see

from the spreadsheet that a lot's been done. A lot still needs to be done. And where we are right now with working with the Government and working with Mr. Ervin is just to substantiate what has been done, and I hope that tomorrow's meeting with Mr. Ervin and with the Government is just an opportunity for us all to sit together, put our heads together, and really just work on what we need to do to prove to the Government and to Mr. Ervin and his team that we are actually -- the City is doing what's necessary and what's ordered in the Consent Decree and that we're staying on track.

So that's my brief overview. I'm happy to answer any questions that Your Honor may have after reviewing the spreadsheet about any -- any of the deadlines that have come and passed and where the City is or where you think the City stands with respect to anything.

THE COURT: There were a number of deadlines where the comment was made that the -- that the plan for -- where the Department of Justice and the Monitoring Team were awaiting documentation from the City to confirm that something had been done. Can you tell me about those? There were a lot of them.

MR. HASTEN: There are a lot of them, Your Honor, and certain of those, that's what we'd like to sit down and meet with them and talk with them about tomorrow too. Certain documentation, we can create to let them know that things are

happening. I'll use an example. The fact that the Consent Decree is being explained to FPD officers and command staff. We can create orientation materials. We can create memos to file, but I think a lot of what — we can create documents for that, Your Honor, but I think we can also satisfy some of these requirements by having Mr. Ervin and his team and the Government come and observe what's being done in Ferguson.

I'll give Your Honor an example. There's many court reforms that need to be done, and one of them is to ensure that defendants are given the opportunity to perform community service instead of paying a fine, and I spoke with Judge Hall last week, and I asked her, "Is this being done?" And she said, "Absolutely, it's being done. I give defendants the opportunity to enter into a payment plan, to come up with a payment plan that they can afford, and if they can't do that, they can perform community service, or I give them a hybrid approach."

And I asked her, I was like, "Is there anything that you want me to convey," to Your Honor, "about what's being done in municipal court," and she told me that she's just excited about the progress that she's seen and just what she's heard from people who have appeared in municipal court and how much it's changed.

So I think there's documentation, obviously, that we can provide orders that have been entered by the court showing

that community service is a viable sentencing option, but I also think that observation and coming and actually watching court, attending these monthly command staff meetings or however often the command staff meetings take place -- we'll be able to substantiate a lot of what's required in the Consent Decree without actually creating documentation.

So to answer Your Honor's question, yes, we'll provide the documentation. Whatever the Monitor deems appropriate or the Government says we need to do to show that we're complying with the Consent Decree, we will absolutely do, but we also think that coming and observing and seeing what's going on in Ferguson will also substantiate what's being done and actually may take the place of some of this documentation that's required.

THE COURT: The -- the other question I had was there were a number of committees and things that the settlement agreement said would be implemented at different times, but different -- like the Neighborhood Policing Steering Committee and other things like that. What's the status of that happening?

MR. HASTEN: So the Neighborhood Policing Steering

Committee is up and running. The City has -- I shouldn't say

it's up and running, but they have been meeting. It's open to

anybody who wants to come and meet. We've discussed with the

Government ways to go about expanding the outreach into the

community to make sure that people know that this group is 1 2 meeting. We're open to ideas. 3 THE COURT: Has the group all been selected, and is there a committee that actually exists that is the committee 4 5 or --MR. HASTEN: Nothing that formal, Your Honor. 6 7 There's an ordinance that will need to be passed, but there is 8 a group of individuals meeting under the title of the 9 Neighborhood Policing Steering Committee. They've been 10 meeting for several months. They've been working with a 11 consultant hired by the City, and I do think that we are somewhat ahead of schedule with that because that's not called 12 13 to be implemented for, I think, 180 days on the Consent 14 Decree. 15 THE COURT: Right. Yeah, most of them were 180 days, 16 but I couldn't tell what was happening now, and so --17 MR. HASTEN: So with the Neighborhood Policing Steering Committee, things are happening now. There is a 18 19 group that's meeting. It's open to anybody who wants to 20 attend. I think, Your Honor, the other thing --21 THE COURT: So that's why -- so it's really just 22 there are meetings happening, but who's running them? 23 MR. HASTEN: The City has hired a consultant --24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. HASTEN: -- Peter O'Neill, who comes in and

attends most of these meetings, I believe, and City Manager De'Carlon Seewood, I also believe, is present for some of these meetings, and I know that the Government attended one meeting in June, and they may be able to speak to that as well, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And the other ones like -- and, again, these are mostly 180-day deadlines, I believe, but they were things like the -- a Training Committee.

MR. HASTEN: A Training Committee that's going to be developed in consultation with the Neighborhood Policing

Steering Committee. So that's also -- I don't know the exact status of that, Your Honor. I can check, but I believe that that's going to be rolled together with the Neighborhood

Policing Steering Committee, and that's something that they -- will be part of their duties.

MR. HASTEN: So the City passed an ordinance authorizing the Civilian Review Board on April 19th, the same day that Your Honor entered the Consent Decree. We provided it to the Department of Justice, and they had some comments on it. So we've been working with them on the comments to that ordinance. It needs to be revised. We'll work on passing a new ordinance to make sure it complies with the Consent Decree. We're going to discuss that with the Government tomorrow. That's on our agenda, and that's currently in the

works.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Maybe, Ms. Lopez, you can tell me whatever else you think I should be asking or whatever else you think that it would be good to hear from your side of the table on.

MS. LOPEZ: Sure. I'd be happy to. First, Your

Honor, I want to say thank you for holding this status

conference. I think it's very helpful to the parties and to

the Monitoring Team and hopefully to the public and the court.

We did want to talk just a little bit about our perspective, the Department of Justice's perspective on how implementation of this Consent Decree is going, not to critique but just because we've been through a lot of these and learned a lot through trial and error. We're hopeful that our thoughts can help not only the Court and the Monitoring Team but really help the City.

One thing I really want to emphasize is a point that Mr. Hasten touched upon, which is the selection of the Monitor. There have been a lot of really positive steps. He's correct that people in the City are working really hard. And, for example, the hiring of Chief Moss was really critical and a really important step forward, but I really want to emphasize the selection of the Monitor because it was a really positive experience. It actually went much better here in Ferguson than it's gone in many of our other departments.

During the Monitor interviews, all but one of the City Council persons attended those, was very engaged, were very thoughtful. The City Manager was there. The Chief was there. We were really able to come together — the City of Ferguson and the Department of Justice — and I feel, you know, to do what was right for the people of Ferguson. The community was involved. There was a public hearing. There was a lot of public feedback on who the Monitoring Team should be, and I really feel that because of that process, because of the public's engagement and the City's engagement, we were able to come up with a team that's really good and with a process that really moved all of us forward together.

And the team is excellent. I'm hoping you'll have the opportunity to hear from them a little bit more later. Each one of them is highly respected in their respective fields. The City is very fortunate to have this team. I know they know they've got their work cut out for them. It's a big job, but they all seem very energetic and engaged. So that whole experience was, for us, a real turning point in this whole endeavor and we hope set us off on a path that will continue and that we'll be able to build upon.

It's hard stuff that the City is trying to do right now, and a lot of the things -- your questions went to sort of the fundamental groundwork things that need to happen for a lot of the progress to build upon, and we're finding those

same issues. I don't think any of us, including the City, are where we'd hoped to be. A lot of deadlines have passed, and they have not been fully implemented, but we're hopeful because of the level of engagement, but there are, I think, three things that we would highlight as useful that are really important to get in place sooner rather than later so that we can build reform on those three things.

One is a very concrete task of hiring a compliance coordinator. The Consent Decree requires this, and currently, the City Manager is trying to serve the role of compliance coordinator, but as you can imagine, he has many other duties, and the compliance coordinator is a position that's really critical. It requires an intensity and a sustained focus that really it's not — someone has to be focused on that job. We understand that the City is planning to do that, to designate someone for that position, and we completely support that because we think that it's that level of focus and oversight that would really help the City move forward more quickly.

The second thing that's really important is developing a mechanism for policy development and review. The agreement requires that all of its provisions be incorporated into policy, and of course, this is very important for the sustainability of the reforms that are made. It's — it's important — the agreement also requires that the Monitoring Team and the Department of Justice review those policies

before they're implemented by the City, and that's really important so that the parties are all on the same page before you train officers, before you start doing something so that we all agree that this is what the settlement agreement requires. There hasn't really been a system in place for the City to develop and — and provide those policies for us for review.

So, for example, you have things like the CRB ordinance being passed before we had the opportunity to review it even though the settlement agreement requires that we review it before it was implemented. You have the Chief drafting a lot of policies and trying to do all that. Again, it's important the Chief be involved but having somebody work with the Chief to do some of that. He's got a lot of other things on their plate. There are a lot of policies to draft. So we're working with the City to come up with a better system so that policies will be developed and we have a system for effective and efficient review by us and by the Monitoring Team so that we can get those in place as quickly as possible.

The third thing is the process, sort of a big umbrella piece, which is the process of verifying that the City has done what it says it has done, and of course, that's critically important. It's important to this Court because, at the end of the day, you are going to need a factual basis upon which to decide that the City's in fact met its

obligations under the decree, and the City is going to need to be able to show you something for that. It's really important to the public legitimacy of this endeavor that the public knows that the City can show the public and the Monitoring Team and the Department of Justice and the Court that it has done the things it said that it would do. Right now, when you ask the City whether they've done this requirement or the other, you often get the response, "Yeah, we're doing that. We're doing that." And they haven't really developed the mindset of or the mechanisms of "How are we going to show everybody that we've done that?" And so we're working with them to help develop those mechanisms.

As Mr. Hasten noted, some of that is observation. Of course, you always have to be careful that things don't happen differently when you're observing than when you're not, but observation is absolutely a key part of that, but there are other ways of documenting things that are going to have to be part of this process, and we have experience with that. The Monitoring Team has experience with that. So we are working with the City to develop those mechanisms, and we — we do hope to be able to do that over the next couple of days, to continue that work.

Another reason that that verification process is important is that when the City begins documenting that it did what it said it did, oftentimes, we find that jurisdictions

realize they actually haven't done what they thought they had done, and it helps make the reform more meaningful and complete -- just that process of having to show others that you've -- that you've done what you've said you're going to do.

So that's just -- you know, there are other big picture things that need to be worked on. A lot of the development of the committees and the plans that you referenced are threshold things that need to happen before other things can build on them, but as far as the three big overarching things that we think are most needed for focus right now to help move the whole process forward, those are the three we would put forward.

But as I said, although we're not where any of us, I think, would hope to be, we are hopeful because we do feel that the City is working hard, and we feel like we've got the commitment from them to do these things that are necessary to move the whole process forward, and we're happy to answer any questions that you have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I think -- I think a lot of the questions I had when I looked at the spreadsheet and then looked at the agreement again to figure out where the issues were -- you know, there was a lot that was supposed to happen kind of immediately, and then there are a lot of deadlines that hit at the 180-day period, and it seems like, you know,

getting from where we are today to that 180-day period, there's a lot more work to be done as well as catching up on the stuff that may not have been done so far.

MS. LOPEZ: Yes, Your Honor. There are 40 due dates that have come due, and over the next -- by October 17th, there are going to be an additional 36 that are due.

THE COURT: Yeah.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS.\ LOPEZ}}$. And then the pace of due dates slows down.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LOPEZ: But a lot of those due dates, they are kind of playing catch-up on, and a lot of them are the really foundational things. So it is really important that -- now is the time for focus. If the City isn't able to focus now, then it sort of -- it has a ripple effect that will result in the decree lasting longer than it should down the line. So we're really trying to get people focused, and we feel that the City is starting to understand that. They've had a lot of other things that they're working on as well. But they're starting to understand that, and we're hopeful that we can move forward together on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Ervin, I guess I would like you to tell me sort of where you think you're headed, and frankly, if you can do it from the lectern, it will probably help us all, and I mean of your group, Professor Norwood is

the only one I know of the group, of course, but I know who the others are. I did read the materials carefully, but I guess I'm curious as I know you've got these meetings set up in the next couple days. So what are you going to be doing? If you can lay out your plan for me and then tell me what — the other thing I'm going to ask from all the parties is what do you need from me; what should I be doing in terms of meeting with you all more frequently as we move forward? None of this really made sense until we got you all set up, and so this is a good time to start doing it. But so tell me what your plan is now going forward and what you see your team doing?

MR. ERVIN: Certainly. Well, thank you, Your Honor. First of all, I want to just say how delighted I and every member of the team is to be engaged in this work. We think it's enormously important, and we are fully engaged in it already. Just to give you a little status report on what we've done so far and what we plan to do, as you've suggested, it seems to us that there really are three broad tasks laid out in the Consent Decree for the Monitor.

The first is reviewing policies and procedures and protocols and training materials and other written materials to make sure that the provisions of those documents conform to those of the Consent Decree, and that process has already begun. With regard, for example, to the Civilian Review Board

ordinance that was referenced, we too -- I and other members of the Monitoring Team -- reviewed that ordinance and have provided comments jointly with DOJ to the City for its review. And just this past weekend, in fact, I and other members of the team provided DOJ some comments on two other policies, the duty to report misconduct policy, which includes a retaliation clause, anti-retaliation clause, and also the duty of candor policy. And so our plan is to continue. These policies have been sent to us in a piecemeal fashion to date, as Ms. Lopez mentioned, and so we intend to continue reviewing them as we receive them, but once a regularized process is established for us to do that, then, of course, we will review it in a regularized fashion.

The second broad category, it seems to us, is to conduct a community survey and also broader outcome assessments to get a sense as time goes by as to, again, whether the provisions of the Consent Decree are in fact being complied with. With regard to the community survey, I'm pleased to report we've already begun that process. As you saw, one of our team members, who regrettably could not be here today, Tom Maronick, an advertising expert from the —formerly from the FTC, has drafted a draft of the community survey as to community attitudes toward the police department. He provided it only to me. I've given him some comments, and then I intend to share that with other members of the team,

and once finalized, I'll share it with DOJ and then with the City.

For the broader outcome assessments, I'm particularly interested in the data that shows stops, searches, citations, arrests, and use of force, et cetera, broken out by protected characteristics, race and other protected characteristics.

One question is whether the City is already keeping such data. I've had discussions with Mr. Hasten about that. We are planning a call early next week, I think notionally Monday, with IT people from my team, with Ms. McLeod and Mr. Maronick from the Monitoring Team, and from the parties to discuss whether such data exists, whether additional data needs to be created. Once we have that data in hand — and I'm hoping that we can have it sooner rather than later, it would seem to me to be fairly easy to use the existing data as a baseline and then to measure progress going forward with regard to each of those categories.

And then, finally, as you know, there is the requirement to conduct evaluation and audits of whether the provisions are not just implemented on paper but whether they're actually working in practice to produce the outcome that we all hope to see, constitutional and lawful policing in the administration of justice at the municipal level. There, it's the Monitor's discretion where he and the team starts. I'm particularly interested, as I'm sure all the parties are

and you, Your Honor, in the level of on a quantitative basis but, more importantly, the quality of police community engagement toward the goal of community policing. And so I know that we will have some meetings tomorrow with the parties. I intend to delve into that. And so, notionally, my plan is to make the first evaluation or audit one that focuses on that, on that particular subject. So that's the first thing I'd say.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Secondly, as you know -- and I think you referenced this implicitly, tonight -- I and other members of the team -and I'm pleased, by the way, that nearly every member of the team is here today, and most of them will be able to stay tonight and tomorrow. Tonight, we are making myself and the team members available for an hour and a half of meetings with individual members of the community who choose to meet with us. A notice, as you know, was posted to that effect. We're meeting from 5:00 to 7:30 tonight. I think every slot has been taken, and I will view -- I do view that as an opportunity for community members face-to-face with me to, one, meet me, of course, and other members of the team to the extent they haven't already done so. Most of them have not. But more importantly, for them to give me their suggestions about how the Monitor and the team should carry out our responsibilities, to ask questions of us as to what our notional ideas are at this point, and just to engage in an

iterative dialogue, and I should stress that -- and I said this during the course of the application process -- I and, to the extent possible, as many members of the team as possible plan to make a regular practice of coming to Ferguson. I plan to do so on at least a six-week basis, if not a monthly basis. So this will just be the first. It's intended to be just the first of many opportunities for me to hear from the community and for the community to hear from me.

And then, finally, as you know, tomorrow -
Mr. Hasten referenced this, as did Ms. Lopez -- we have a full
day of meetings with the parties to delve into the particulars
of where we are with regard to these various provisions of the
Consent Decree, and so we're on board and fully engaged and
look forward very much to engaging further as time goes by.

THE COURT: The Consent Decree has certain deadlines, times when you are to provide reports to the Court, but it doesn't specify exactly how those get provided. Are they public reports that are then filed and, therefore, available to everyone in the public, or are they in some other format? What do you think is the best way to handle that?

MR. ERVIN: My preference, Your Honor, would be that they be public reports, or at least there'd be a public version of the report. My understanding from reviewing other monitorships in other cities is that that is, certainly, the typical practice, and I know that there is such intense

interest not just here in Ferguson, of course, among Ferguson community members, but nationally in what the Monitor is finding, what the Monitor is recommending that that would be my recommendation.

THE COURT: Okay. Yeah. I mean that would be my preference too. I just wanted to make sure that you were on that as well.

And I know -- and this may be a question really for the parties as much as for the Monitor. I know in some other cities where they have similar or somewhat similar consent decrees and monitoring situations, the court holds informal or formal meetings with the parties and the monitor, some to which the community is invited, some, I guess, to which they aren't. It depends case by case. What do you all think? I guess, what do you think -- and then I'll ask the other people this too -- should happen in terms of my continued engagement? I mean, obviously, there's going to be some, but what do you think is the best way to do it?

MR. ERVIN: I'm glad you asked that question, Your Honor. We were having a little discussion about that in fact beforehand. I personally -- and I think I speak for members of the team -- would welcome as much interaction with you as possible. I think it would be very useful to have at least the opportunity for private conversations with you, perhaps, you and I, and then private conversations with the parties,

and then to the extent, as you suggested, it makes sense — and I would think that this would be more often the case than not, that those sessions be public.

THE COURT: Yeah. I know -- I know -- and how often do you think that should happen?

MR. ERVIN: Notionally, I would think quarterly.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ERVIN: I think sooner than that is probably too soon. I think later than that is probably too late. I think quarterly makes a lot of sense.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that is -- I think those are pretty much the questions I have at this time. I want to thank you for --

MR. ERVIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- taking on this role and the members of the team as well. It is important. I think that's -- so thank you.

MR. ERVIN: Thank you very much.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Hasten, I had a couple of questions for you that I thought of. Actually, I'd like to hear your comments on the things I just asked Mr. Ervin as well in terms of what you think in terms of the Court's role going forward, how often I should be meeting with you all, and what kind of, you know, public, private reports, et cetera, that should be -- you know, what involvement you think needs

to come from me.

MR. HASTEN: I'm in agreement with Mr. Ervin. I think your involvement, we would welcome, and your continued involvement too. I think quarterly status hearings make sense. I would think that those quarterly status hearings would be public.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. HASTEN: And then if need be, we could have more frequent informal telephone conferences between the parties, between you and Mr. Ervin and Mr. Ervin's team without the parties. Whatever you think, but I think that quarterly status hearings make sense.

THE COURT: They would be open to the public, and that would have -- public filings ahead of time, much like you did this time, would be helpful.

MR. HASTEN: Correct.

THE COURT: Yeah. No. I agree with that.

So I have a question -- I see Mr. Patrick here from the Post-Dispatch, and I know there are other -- there may be other media here as well. This morning's newspaper said that -- or maybe it was yesterday's newspaper -- that the City was having difficulty hiring enough -- filling all its vacancies in the police department. Is that true?

MR. HASTEN: From my conversations with Mr. Seewood, that that has been an issue within the department, yes.

THE COURT: And so what's going forward as the 1 2 solution with this, or how is it affecting implementation of the Consent Decree, I guess, is really what I want to ask. 3 MR. HASTEN: It's going to affect implementation of 4 5 the Consent Decree just because, as deadlines approach, there 6 are certain things with training and with establishing a 7 recruitment policy. I do believe this is something -- I'd 8 like to confer with Mr. Seewood, if I could have a moment --9 THE COURT: Yeah. MR. HASTEN: -- so I could get a better answer, but I 10 11 do believe that the City is in the process of trying to hire 12 some new officers, that that hasn't happened yet, but there's obviously overlap with hiring new officers and making sure 13 14 that the hiring process comports with what's required of the 15 Consent Decree. 16 THE COURT: Right. And I think the paper indicated 17 they're working on it too, and there were some things 18 mentioned. 19 In terms of -- well, actually, I think that's my --20 those are my questions for you for now. 21 From the Department of Justice, tell me what your 22 perspective on these issues are. 23 MS. LOPEZ: Thank you, Your Honor. First, just to

get back to your question about the public reports, paragraph

438 of the agreement does address public reports by the

24

25

Monitor, and they're required every six months.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LOPEZ: So I think that we would -- we would -- and that's been our policy at the Department of Justice, that we do very much support those reports being public.

Similarly, we do like to keep the proceedings before the Court in public as much as possible. We do think it's appropriate for the Monitor and the Court to meet in private however and whenever you think is helpful to the Court in doing your -- filling your role here, and there are times that it may be appropriate for there to be in camera proceedings with all the parties, but those, obviously, should be the exception, not the rule. So we would very much support quarterly status hearings and more frequent conversations between the Court and the Monitoring Team if you would like, and we have no objection, of course, to private conversations between -- between this Court and the Monitoring Team.

I did want to speak a little bit about the hiring.

We've talked -- we've reviewed the staffing studies of the consultant that was hired by the City. We've spoken with him on several occasions. We -- it is unclear to us how he -- he says that there are -- is a need for 49 sworn officers to carry out the requirements of the Consent Decree. We are not sure whether that's exactly the right number. There are some assumptions in there that we need to figure out a little bit

more, but we certainly don't disagree that the City, you know, should go forward with hiring. We just want to have one cautionary note, which is that we've been in this situation many, many times where, under pressure to hire, a city will create more trouble in hiring officers quickly than it resolved by hiring officers. There are a number of jurisdictions you can look at where they really found themselves in pretty disastrous situations because they hired too quickly. The settlement agreement has a number of requirements that are meant to ensure that this doesn't happen and that high quality officers are hired and retained by the City, and we've already talked with the City about working with them to try to do whatever we can to get those requirements in place first so that they are -- they are hiring people the right way. There are things like background screenings, recruitment plans, training, making sure that salaries for officers are competitive so that they attract officers and then, once they're trained, retain officers. There are a lot of things in the agreement that go towards exactly this question. So we're really trying to work with the City, and we will be insistent that officers that are hired are hired in accordance with the requirements of the Consent Decree so that we can have the highest quality officers in Ferguson and not create new problems for the City and the people of Ferguson.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I am -- you know, I knew when I approved this it was going to be a lot of work. I was concerned about all those deadlines, as was everyone. I don't think that's a surprise, but it seems like there's good progress being made, and especially, I think it's great that people are actually working together.

What else do I need to know from you all today?

MR. HASTEN: I have nothing else, Your Honor. I just noted that Mayor Knowles is also in attendance. I just wanted to --

THE COURT: Okay. Yeah. I saw him walk in. I see Mayor Knowles.

Anything further from the Department of Justice?

MS. LOPEZ: Nothing, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: If it's -- if nobody objects, I'd like to meet with the Monitoring Team very briefly in my chambers afterward. I've got a number of other things going on, so it won't be a long meeting, but I'd like to shake your hands and say hello to each of you individually.

I also -- I think what I will try to do going forward is I'll look at my calendar and try to set up some dates for hearings, and then what I will do is have someone on my staff contact the council. You know, I can set hearings, and then you all can ask me to change them because somebody can't be there and it's a bad date. So I'd rather not go through that

I'd rather set the next status conference once we know your schedules. So I'll have somebody on my staff be contacting you with proposed dates for the next status conference, and -- and I might -- I can talk to the Monitor. I might be -- I might be asking them -- I think I probably will be asking them to give me some more informal reports as time goes by, just to know how things are going in the -- for instance, I'm very curious to see how things go on the next few days with these meetings, but I'm not sure I need a formal status report, but I do think formal status reports that are public and are filed in the public docket are very important, and I'd like to keep the nonpublic meetings to a minimum because I know that that causes everybody consternation because they think we're doing things behind closed doors when we're probably not really doing much, but I want to make sure we're doing almost as much as we can on the public record so the public and anyone who is interested can see what we've done and is available. So I will continue to try to do that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are -- I have spoken to a few judges around the country who have handled ongoing consent decrees between municipalities and the Department of Justice. None of them are the same. Obviously, they're not the same as this case. So I know that there are different approaches to how involved the judges are and how I -- I don't really want to get this to be my full-time job. I actually have another full-time job.

32 1 You know, I have other cases. So I don't want to be the one 2 monitoring this, but -- and I appreciate that you all are doing it, but I do want to, you know, know what is happening. 3 So I will try to set up some schedules for future conferences. 4 5 I wish you good luck tomorrow. Keep working on it. I mean it 6 is -- it sounds to me like the City has done a lot of work, a 7 huge amount of work, and I appreciate that, but, you know, as you all know, there's a lot more work to be done, and so 8 9 you've got to really keep at it, but right now I'm pleased to 10 hear the result. I think -- I'm very hopeful that going 11 forward this is going to be successful. 12 So I would ask -- what I'll do is I'll ask my -- this 13 will conclude the status conference today, and I will set a 14 future status conference that will be public just like this 15 one, and we'll do that by order, which probably won't go out

will conclude the status conference today, and I will set a future status conference that will be public just like this one, and we'll do that by order, which probably won't go out immediately but over the next couple of weeks, and then I will ask Ms. Brown to show the -- show you all how to come back into chambers, and you can meet with me briefly so I can shake your hands, and that won't take very long, I don't think, because, like I say, everybody's got things to do, but thank you, all, very much.

Okay. Court's in recess.

(Proceedings concluded at 1:44 p.m.)

24

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

CERTIFICATE

I, Gayle D. Madden, Registered Diplomate Reporter and Certified Realtime Reporter, hereby certify that I am a duly appointed Official Court Reporter of the United States

District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

I further certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings held in the above-entitled case and that said transcript is a true and correct transcription of my stenographic notes.

I further certify that this transcript contains pages 1 through 32 inclusive.

Dated at St. Louis, Missouri, this 19th day of October, 2016.

/s/ Gayle D. Madden

GAYLE D. MADDEN, CSR, RDR, CRR

Official Court Reporter